

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
CAMDEN VICINAGE**

RIYA DEV CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMGUARD INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

Civil No. 22-6415 (RMB-EAP)

ORDER

THIS MATTER came before Court upon the Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) filed by Plaintiff Riya Dev Corporation. [Docket No. 62.] Defendant AmGUARD Insurance Company opposes the Motion. [Docket No. 63.] Plaintiff Riya Dev Corporation filed a reply brief in further support of its Motion. [Docket No. 64.] Having considered the parties' submissions without oral argument pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 78(b) and Local Civil Rule 78.1(b) and for good cause shown,

IT IS, on this 14th day of May, 2025; hereby

1. **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**;¹ and it is finally

¹ When a party seeks reconsideration of a judgment under Rule 59(e), the judgment may be altered or amended if the party seeking reconsideration shows at least one of the following grounds: (1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence that was not available when the court granted the motion for summary judgment; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice. *Max's Seafood Cafe ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999) (citing *North River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)). Plaintiff cites no intervening change in the controlling law or new evidence that was not available when the Court granted the motion for summary judgment. And Plaintiff also does not identify any clear error of law or fact; instead, it merely disagrees with the Court's decision to grant summary judgment. But disagreement is not an

2. Defendant's request for leave to file a sur-reply letter is **DENIED as MOOT**. [Docket No. 65.]

s/Renée Marie Bumb
RENÉE MARIE BUMB
Chief United States District Judge

appropriate basis for reconsideration. *United States v. Compaction Sys. Corp.*, 88 F. Supp. 2d 339, 345 (D.N.J. 1999). So, the Motion is denied.